DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 843 HE 026 264

AUTHOR	Foster, Laura Kliewer
TITLE	Strengthening Higher Education in the Midwest: The Course of Interstate Cooperation. A Report.
INSTITUTION	Council of State Governments, Lombard, IL. Midwestern Legislative Conference.
REPORT NO	EI-22
PUB DATE	Nov 89
NOTE	13p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Midwestern Legislative Conference, 641 East Butterfield Road, Suite 401, Lombard, IL 60148-5651 ($4).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Cooperation; Coordination; Financial Exigency; Financial Problems; *Higher Education; Long Range Planning; State Agencies; State Colleges; State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Interstate Compacts; *United States (Midwest); Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

ABSTRACT

In order to strengthen midwestern higher education, and despite two previously unsuccessful attempts, the possibility of pursuing regional cooperation in higher education through a higher education compact among the midwestern states is once more being explored. This report seeks to facilitate the decision making process by providing background information on compacts, other regions' higher education cooperation experience, and the state of higher education in the Midwest. An introductory section offers initial arguments for looking at ways to bolster regional education including recent and continuing budget cuts and social changes. A subsequent section examines a similar arrangement, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), describing level of participation, benefits of the arrangement, and programs sponsored by the WICHE. This section also briefly compares WICHE to other regional agreements in the Southern and New England states, particularly in the areas of funding, representation, number of states needed to ratify the compact, and legislative provisions. The next section analyzes the history and theory of interstate compacts particularly in higher education. This section covers the scope of higher education compacts, noting that they have the force of statutory law though they do not infringe on the powers of the individual states to control higher education. A section on the condition of higher education in the Midwest evaluates economic difficulties, their effect on funding for higher education, and state and institutional responses to the fiscal crisis. An appendix contains the text of the Western Regional Education Compact. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED354843

EMERGING ISSUES

Strengthening Higher Education in the Midwest: The Course of Interstate Cooperation

A Report of the

MIDWESTERN LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE

of the Council of State Governments

HE 026 264

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Council of State Governments

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

641 East Butterfield Road, Suite 401, Lombard, Illinois 60148-5651 (708) 810-0210

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Report of the

Midwestern Legislative Conference

Strengthening Higher Education in the Midwest: The Course of Interstate Cooperation

Prepared by:
Laura Kliewer Foster

November 1989

EI-22

Price: $4.00

Table of Contents

Why a Midwestern Higher Education Compact 1

Table 1: Number of Institutions in the Midwest, by State 1

I. Case Study: WICHE 2

Table 2: Midwestern States' Schools for the Health Professions 2

II. Interstate Compacts 4

The Scope of a Higher Education Compact 4

III. The State of Higher Education in the Midwest 5

Table 3: State Spending on Higher Education 5

Table 4: Midwestern Public 4-year Universities' Undergraduate Tuitions 6

Conclusion 7

Why a Midwestern Higher Education Compact?

The Midwestern states have been striving to ensure the outstanding quality of higher education institutions for which the region is renowned, while realizing that budget restrictions and other factors are severely limiting that goal. In our fast-changing, world-wide community, it is becoming increasingly evident that few, if any, of the states can provide *all* of the educational opportunities and resources their residents require. Several states have established bilateral cooperation agreements, usually allowing for student exchange between the states in fields that are not offered in both states. On a more comprehensive level, *regional* voluntary cooperation in higher education has proved advantageous in the Southern, New England and Western states. This cooperation has taken many forms, from student exchange programs to telecommunications cooperatives.

The Midwestern states have made two previous attempts to establish a higher education compact. The first occured in the mid-60s. In 1976 the Education Committee of the Midwestern Conference (now the Midwestern Legislative Conference) of CSG began working on a compact with input from the Midwestern Governors' Conference. The compact was endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Midwestern Conference in 1977, and action on it by the states began. The compact stipulated that six states join by the end of 1981 in order for it to become operational. By this deadline date, only four states (Ohio, Minnesota, Nebraska and South Dakota) had passed enabling legislation to activate the compact.

Since that time, cutbacks in federal aid in many areas, economic problems in agriculture and manufacturing industries as well as other factors specific to each state have forced the states to reapportion the shrinking pie of state appropriations. All the states save one in the Midwest appropriated less for higher education in 1988 than in 1978, when adjusted for inflation.

The Midwestern Legislative Conference, under the direction of the Higher Education Issue Conference Steering Committee, is again exploring the possibility of pursuing regional cooperation in higher education through a higher education compact. This report seeks to facilitate the decision-making process by providing background information on compacts, other regions' higher education cooperation experience, and the state of higher education in the Midwest.

TABLE 1

Number of Institutions in the Midwest, by State: Fall 1987

	Public 4-year	Public 2-year	Private 4-year	Private 2-year	Vocational
Illinois	12	47	91	16	443
Indiana	14	15	38	11	168
Iowa	3	20	36	6	96
Kansas	8	21	21	4	91
Michigan	15	31	49	8	356
Minnesota	10	23	33	11	138
Missouri	13	14	54	12	239
Nebraska	7	13	13	2	58
North Dakota	6	8	3	1	28
Ohio	22	39	65	29	345
South Dakota	7	0	9	3	24
Wisconsin	13	18	30	3	129
Total	**130**	**249**	**442**	**106**	**2,115**

Source: The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, September 6, 1989

I. Case Study: WICHE

Should the Midwestern states decide to band together to assist the region through cooperation, other regions' successes will be very helpful as examples. Higher education compacts have facilitated unique bases for cooperation among the states within the Western, Southern and New England regions. The endeavors of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), the interstate agency created by the Western Regional Education Compact, serves as a good case study of regional cooperation strengthening higher education.

The Western Regional Education Compact, organized in 1951, was adopted by 13 Western states and has two affiliate states (see Appendix for the Compact's text).

The Western states' original purpose in adopting a regional compact was the provision of professional student exchange. WICHE's **Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP)** has saved sending states uncountable millions of dollars otherwise needed to provide their own programs in a variety of fields, most of which are in health-related areas. Students pay resident tuition and the sending states pay an additional "support fee" established by WICHE and appropriated by state legislatures. As a result of this arrangement, the West has only three schools of veterinary medicine. Through a unique arrangement, one of these veterinary schools trains veterinarians for 10 states in the West, saving the sending states the cost and competition of maintaining their own program. This same region has only 16 medical schools and eight dental schools to serve students from 15 states.

TABLE 2

Midwestern States' Schools for the Health Professions

	Medical		Dental		Veterinary		Optometry	
State	Pub.	Priv.	Pub.	Priv.	Pub.	Priv.	Pub.	Priv.
Illinois	2	6	2	2	1	0	0	1
Indiana	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Iowa	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Kansas	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Michigan	3	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Minnesota	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Missouri	2	2	1	0	1	0	1	0
Nebraska	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	6	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
South Dakota	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Total	**21**	**10**	**9**	**6**	**9**	**0**	**4**	**1**

Source: Midwestern Legislative Conference reporting, from Midwestern states' higher education coordinating boards

For graduate students, the **Western Regional Graduate Programs (WRGP)** extends full tuition reciprocity in certain specialized graduate programs. The programs are nominated by institutions and chosen by a regional committee through a review process intended to assure that the programs are distinctive.

WICHE's newest student exchange program is the **Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE)**. Initiated in Fall 1988, WUE allows nonresident students to pay 50 percent more than the school's standard state resident tuition, a considerable savings over most nonresidents' tuition. Currently, 74 institutions participate.

In addition to its strong student exchange programs, WICHE has strengthened the link between higher education and economic development. The Commission has established a regional supercomputer network to link research institutions in the Northwest with the National Science Foundation's supercomputer network.

This summer, WICHE also established a cooperative to facilitate the sharing of telecommunications technologies, programs and resources on an interstate basis for educational and other purposes. This dues-paying membership organization is open to Western public and private higher education institutions, state government agencies and nonprofit organizations.

To aid in the international education needed for the shift to more international competitiveness, WICHE compiled, published and is updating information about 180 academic centers of international expertise in the West. The Commission has also identified "intensive" language programs and other international programs in the region, to assist planning for programs in which teachers and others in government and business can enroll.

Another area of concern to WICHE is the changing demography of the Southwest, and specifically the need for educational systems to be more responsive to minority students. The WICHE Regional Policy Committee on Minorities in Higher Education has widely distributed a report and recommendations which have received widespread endorsement from education, government and the media. In a similar vein, WICHE held a regional Legislative Workshop on this issue and has identified several models of effective institutional practice throughout the region and nationally. WICHE has published descriptive summaries of these programs.

WICHE also is pursuing regional collaboration on issues surrounding higher education's role in rural development. The Commission has organized meetings on the subject, as well as a workshop on higher education and rural development.

The **WICHE Mental Health Program** provides a mental health information clearinghouse and technical assistance center for the region, conducts workshops and conferences, and coordinates multistate studies and demonstration projects on mental health issues of common concern to the Western states.

As these efforts indicate, WICHE has, over the years, successfully initiated a variety of methods to help strengthen higher education in the Western states through cooperation.

The Southern and the New England states also have longstanding experience in higher education cooperation. The Southern Regional Education Compact, composed in 1949, established the first regional board to foster development and joint use of higher education facilities throughout the region. In 1955, the New England Higher Education Compact created the New England Board of Higher Education. Both of these compacts' provisions vary slightly from the West's, and differences in these compacts can be explored in the creation of a Midwestern higher education compact.

Some of these deviations include:

Funding -- Under the Western region's compact, dues are apportioned equally among member states and total approximately 36 percent of WICHE's budget. The Southern states also contribute equally to the SREB, with the determined amount reviewed no less than every five years. Basic funding to support NEBHE's programs is provided by the six New England states which make annual assessments according to a regional population formula.

Representation -- The governor of each state appoints three Commissioners to govern WICHE. The NEBHE consists of eight members from each of the six states, appointed variously by the governor, speaker of the house, or president of the senate. The Southern Regional Education Board is comprised of the governor of each state and four persons appointed by each governor, one being a legislator and at least one from the field of education.

Number of states needed to ratify the Compact -- Each regional higher education compact has stipulated how many states must ratify the compact by a certain date. As the number of states in each region vary, so do the number stipulated to ratify the compact. The Western Regional Education Compact, having had the possibility of 13 member states, made the compact operational upon five states' adoption.

Provisions of the compact -- Each compact details the creation of a board or commission, and the duties of this interstate agency.

II. Interstate Compacts

Use of compacts has been a longstanding method of solving joint problems among two or more states[1]. They have dealt with such diverse problems as corrections and crime control, transportation, water apportionment, pest control, nuclear energy and **the expansion and improvement of higher education**. Nearly half of these compacts have provided for the establishment of interstate administrative agencies.

A compact has the force of statutory law. All legal principles applicable to the interpretation of statutes is also applicable to the interpretation of compacts. Interstate compacts are also contracts, and as such are subject to contract law.

In offering and accepting a compact, the almost universal method has been to enact the verbatim compact text as the body of a statute, declaring the state's adherence to it. Identical texts in the laws of all compacting jurisdictions guarantees that the agreement accepted is the same as that offered. After enactment into law by the legislatures of the participating states, the compact would include gubernatorial consent to the same extent as ordinary bills.

The Scope of a Higher Education Compact

Stating that compacts have the force of statutory law and of contracts does not translate into allowing the compact's enforcers to coerce member states into a given action. Speaking at the Midwestern Legislative Conference annual meeting in August, Dr. Phillip Sirotkin, executive director of WICHE, emphasized this point:

> It is important to take note that regional higher education agencies do not infringe on the powers of the individual states to control higher education or in any way limit the flexibility of actions by the states or their institutions of higher education. Cooperation and collaboration are our bywords, not coercion or legal mandate. **We do not represent another bureaucratic, regional level of government imposed on either the states or on higher education. We do not have any power over states or institutions.** [emphasis his]

As stated above, none of the agencies created by higher education compacts has any authority or control over the educational policy of individual states or institutions. They work by building consensus among member states, seeking to secure agreement among states and institutions on mutually advantageous projects.

---

[1] Although the United States Constitution provides that "No State shall, without the consent of Congress . . . enter in agreement or compact with another State or with a foreign power . . . ", only certain types of compacts need Congressional consent. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Virginia v. Tennessee* that only compacts which affect a power delegated to the national government or which affect the "political balance" of the federal system need Congress' consent.

In considering a Midwestern higher education compact, the states involved can look to the Southern Regional Education Compact's history as assurance that Congressional consent is not necessary:

> The Southern Regional Education Compact has been in operation for a number of years without specific consent of Congress. In this case, legislative intent may be inferred from the action of the Senate in sending a House-passed joint resolution back to committee, from which it never emerged, to determine whether it needed Congressional consent. This followed debate on the floor in which it was widely contended that the agreement was not of such character as to require Congressional consent since the states are constitutionally in possession of power over education and the agreement would not affect the balance of power within the federal system.
>
> *The Law and Use of Interstate Compacts, 21*

III. The State of Higher Education in the Midwest

Many different considerations loom large in the financing of higher education. Some of these are common to all the Midwestern states, while others tend to be confined to a few, depending on the geography, population and economic development of each state. All states have been hit one way or another by economic woes, especially the agriculture states.

Midwestern states appropriated up to 18% more for higher education in 1988/89 than in 1986/87. Yet, with the purchasing power of dollars declining, only Ohio in the Midwest has increased appropriations for higher education in real dollars over the last ten years (see Table 3). Minnesota is currently the only Midwestern state that appropriates more than the national average per student.

TABLE 3

State Spending on Higher Education

State	State Appropriations 1988-89[1]	State Spending on Student Aid 1988-89[1]	Percent Change in Appropriations: 1986/87 - 1988/89[1]
Illinois	$1,399,444,000	$159,436,000	+ 1%
Indiana	755,614,000	52,062,000	+14%
Iowa	478,991,000	52,916,000	+18%
Kansas	382,326,000	6,031,000	+17%
Michigan	1,338,033,000	74,409,000	+ 9%
Minnesota	861,462,000	64,640,000	+10%
Missouri	550,609,000	14,595,000	+16%
Nebraska	253,431,000	1,793,000	+18%
North Dakota	118,072,000	1,118,000	- 2%
Ohio	1,320,460,000	72,862,000	+ 9%
South Dakota	77,369,000	596,000	+ 7%
Wisconsin	738,670,000	38,061,000	+11%

State	Amount Appropriated per Student 1987-88[2]	Percent Change in Appropriations 1978-88 Adjusted for Inflation[2]
Illinois	$3,486	- 7.3
Indiana	3,723	- 6.3
Iowa	3,903	- 9.3
Kansas	3,486	- 5.1
Michigan	3,684	- 4.5
Minnesota	4,080	- 11.4
Missouri	3,652	- 9.0
Nebraska	2,955	- 21.0
North Dakota	3,016	- 20.2
Ohio	3,324	+ 5.7
South Dakota	2,705	- 24.5
Wisconsin	3,796	- 13.4
National Average	**$4,053**	**N.A.**

Sources:

[1] *The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac*; September 6, 1989

[2] *State Profiles: Financing Public Higher Education 1978 to 1988*, Research Associates of Washington

Some states are looking into comprehensive changes. In Missouri, for example, outgoing Commissioner of Higher Education Shaila Aery recommended sweeping changes for Missouri institutions to make them cost-efficient. University of Missouri officials are trying to stir public interest in a tax increase proposal to aid higher education next year, while others have suggested discontinuing certain programs or even closing some schools. A consulting firm hired by the Iowa Board of Regents to study duplication at Iowa's three state universities recommended large-scale restructuring, including the elimination of several longstanding programs.

Skyrocketing tuition has plagued higher education institutions. Resident tuition at public 4-year universities in the Midwest went up an average of roughly 7.85% between the 1987/88 and 1988/89 school years, and an overall average of roughly another 6.25% this year (see Table 4).

TABLE 4

Midwestern Public Four-Year Universities' Undergraduate Tuitions[1]

	Resident Tuition 1989/90	Nonresident Tuition 1989/90	Percentage Tuition Increase 1987/88-1988/89	Percentage Tuition Increase 1988/89 - 1989/90
Illinois	$2,103[2]	*	24.2%	5.9%
Indiana	$1,738	*	5.8%	5.8%
Iowa	$1,818	$5,316	7.0%	7.0%
Kansas	$1,072	$3,418	3.0%	5.0%
Michigan	$2,107	N/A	10.0%	8.7%
Minnesota	$1,820[3]	$3,863[3]	4.4%	7.4%
Missouri	$1,382[4]	$3,083[4]	4.8%	N/A
Nebraska	$1,251	$2,544	9.5%	4.5%
North Dakota	$1,182	$2,952	5.3%	5.3%
Ohio	$2,446[5]	$5,467[5]	9.6%	7.3%
South Dakota	$1,781	$2,976	5.0%	5.0%
Wisconsin	$1,625	$5,372	5.7%	6.8%

[1] Unweighted averages, unless otherwise noted
[2] Mean
[3] Based on 16 credits per quarter, 3 quarters per year
[4] 1989/90 figures are not available. Figures shown are for 1988/89.
[5] Does not include Shawnee University

* Nonresident tuition is generally 3 times that of resident tuition in these states

Source: Midwestern Legislative Conference reporting, from Midwestern states' higher education coordinating boards

Some states are steadily increasing the percentage that resident undergraduates pay toward the cost of their education. In Wisconsin, for example, the students' percentage increased from 27% in 1983/84 to 31.6% this school year.

Maintaining competitive salaries for faculty is a constant issue. Three-fourths of the Midwestern states fall below the national average in their average pay to full-time faculty members of public 4-year institutions. South Dakota's is the lowest in the country, a fact which has recently resulted in proposals by the state's Board of Regents for boosting faculty salaries. During the last two years, the University of Wisconsin system has requested and received appropriations from the legislature for "catch-up" pay raises seeking to bring faculty salaries in line with those of comparable universities. Although lawmakers say this should be the last round, the system's president has warned he may request catch-up pay raises for another year.

Of course the state of higher education in the Midwest is not all negative. Many schools are experiencing record enrollments. States are initiating varying forms of prepaid tuition plans. Yet each region except the Midwest has initiated higher education compacts and, through their interstate agency, is exploring areas of prospective cooperation and successfully implementing programs that have saved states millions of dollars over the years.

Conclusion

Cooperation in technology, programs, information and/or any other mutually beneficial area: this is the opportunity the Midwestern states will consider. The Midwest does have a history of cooperation in higher education. Most states have established some type of reciprocity agreement with another state or states. They are usually program- or institution-specific. Two Midwestern states, North Dakota and South Dakota, have affiliated with WICHE. Other Midwestern states are currently considering affiliating with another region's higher education compact. Yet in order to strengthen this region -- economically as well as educationally -- legislators and educators may want to stay in their own back yard and consider forming a higher education compact of the Midwestern states.

The Western Regional Education COMPACT

Entered into by and between the States and Territories signatory hereto, to provide acceptable and efficient educational facilities to meet the needs of the Western Region of the United States of America.

I WHEREAS, the future of this Nation and of the Western States is dependent upon the quality of the education of its youth; and

WHEREAS, many of the Western States individually do not have sufficent numbers of potential students to warrant the establishment and maintenance within their borders of adequate facilities in all of the essential fields of technical professional, and graduate training, nor do all the states have the financial ability to furnish within their borders institutions capable of providing acceptable standards of training in all of the fields mentioned above; and

WHEREAS, it is believed that the Western States, or groups of such states within the Region, cooperatively can provide acceptable and efficient educational facilities to meet the needs of the Region and of the students therof:

Now, therefore, the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii do hereby Covenant and agree as follows:

II Each of the compacting states and territories pledges to each of the other compacting states and territories faithful cooperation in carrying out all the purposes of this Compact.

III The compacting states and territories hereby create the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, hereinafter called the Commission. Said Commission shall be a body corporate of each compacting state and territory and an agency thereof. The Commission shall have all the powers and duties set forth herein, including the power to sue and be sued, and such additional powers as may be conferred upon it by subsequent action of the respective legislatures of the compacting states and territories.

IV The Commission shall consist of three resident members from each compacting state or territory. At all times one Commissioner from each compacting state or territory shall be an educator engaged in the field of higher education in the state or territory from which he is appointed.

The Commissioners from each state and territory shall be appointed by the Governor thereof as provided by law in such state or territory. Any Commissioner may be removed or suspended from office as provided by the law of the state or territory from which he shall have been appointed.

The terms of each Commissioner shall be four years: Provided, however, that the first three Commissioners shall be appointed as follows; one for two years, one for three years, and one for four years. Each Commissioner shall hold office until his successor shall be appointed and qualified. If any office becomes vacant for any reason, the Governor shall appoint a Commissioner to fill the office for the remainder of the unexpired term.

V Any business transacted at any meeting of the Commission must be by affirmative vote of a majority of the whole number of compacting states and territories.

One or more Commissioners from a majority of the compacting states and territories shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Each compacting state and territory represented at any meeting of the Commission is entitled to one vote.

VI The Commission shall elect from its number a chairman and a vice chairman and may appoint, and at its pleasure dismiss or remove, such officers, agents, and employees as may be required to carry out the purpose of this Compact; and shall fix and determine their duties, qualifications and compensation, having due regard for the importance of the responsibilities involved.

The Commissioners shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for their actual and necessary expenses from the funds of the Commission.

VII The Commission shall adopt a seal and by-laws and shall adopt and promulgate rules and regulations for its management and control.

The Commission may elect such committees as it deems necessary for the carrying out of its functions.

The Commission shall establish and maintain an office within one of the compacting states for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time, but in any event must meet at least once a year. The Chairman may call such additional meetings and upon the request of a majority of the Commissioners of three or more compacting states or territories shall call additional meetings.

The Commission shall submit a budget to the Governor of each compacting state and territory at such time and for such period as may be required.

The Commission shall, after negotiations with interested institutions, determine the cost of providing the facilities for graduate and professional education for use in its contractual agreements throughout the Region.

On or before the fifteenth day of January of each year, the Commission shall submit to the Governors and Legislatures of the compacting states and territories a report of its activities for the preceding calendar year.

The Commission shall keep accurate books of account, showing in full its receipts and disbursements, and said books of account shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by the Governor of any compacting state or territory or his designated representative. The Commission shall not be subject to audit and accounting procedure of any of the compacting states or territories. The Commission shall provide for an independent annual audit.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VIII It shall be the duty of the Commission to enter into such contractual agreements with any institutions in the Region offering graduate or professional education and with any of the compacting states or territories as may be required in the judgment of the Commission to provide adequate services and facilities of graduate and professional education for the citizens of the respective compacting states or territories. The Commission shall first endeavor to provide adequate services and facilities in the fields of dentistry, medicine, public health, and veterinary medicine, and may undertake similar activities in other professional and graduate fields.

For this purpose the Commission may enter into contractual agreements—

(a) with the governing authority of any educational institution in the Region, or with any compacting state or territory, to provide such graduate or professional educational services upon terms and conditions to be agreed upon between contracting parties, and

(b) with the governing authority of any educational institution in the Region or with any compacting state or territory to assist in the placement of graduate or professional students in educational institutions in the Region providing the desired services and facilities, upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe.

It shall be the duty of the Commission to undertake studies of needs for professional and graduate educational facilities in the Region, the resources for meeting such needs, and the long-range effects of the Compact on higher education; and from time to time to prepare comprehensive reports on such research for presentation to the Western Governor's Conference and to the legislatures of the compacting states and territories. In conducting such studies, the Commission may confer with any national or regional planning body which may be established. The Commission shall draft and recommend to the Governors of the various compacting states and territories, uniform legislation dealing with problems of higher education in the Region.

For the purposes of this Compact the word "Region" shall be construed to mean the geographical limits of the several compacting states and territories.

IX The operating costs of the Commission shall be apportioned equally among the compacting states and territories.

X This Compact shall become operative and binding immediately as to those states and territories adopting it whenever five or more of the states or territories of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Alaska and Hawaii have duly adopted it prior to July 1, 1953. This Compact shall become effective as to any additional states or territories adopting thereafter at the time of such adoption.

XI This Compact may be terminated at any time by consent of a majority of the compacting states and territories. Consent shall be manifested by passage and signature in the usual manner of legislation expressing such consent by the legislature and Governor of such terminating state. Any state or territory may at any time withdraw from this Compact by means of appropriate legislation to that end. Such withdrawal shall not become effective until two years after written notice thereof by the Governor of the withdrawing state or territory accompanied by a certified copy of requisite legislative action is received by the Commission. Such withdrawal shall not relieve the withdrawing state or territory from its obligations hereunder accruing prior to the effective date of withdrawal. The withdrawing state or territory may rescind its action of withdrawal at any time within the two-year period. Thereafter, the withdrawing state or territory may be reinstated by applicatoin to and the approval by a majority vote of the Commission.

XII If any compacting state or territory shall at any time default in the performance of any of its obligations assumed or imposed in accordance with the provisions of this Compact, all rights, privileges and benefits conferred by this Compact or agreements hereunder shall be suspended from the effective date of such default as fixed by the Commission.

Unless such default shall be remedied within a period of two years following the effective date of such default, this Compact may be terminated with respect to such defaulting state or territory by affirmative vote of three-fourths of the other member states or territories.

Any such defaulting state may be reinstated by: (a) performing all acts and obligations upon which it has heretofore defaulted, and (b) application to and the approval by a majority vote of the Commission.

This compact is now in full force and effect, having been approved by the Governors and Legislatures of more than five of the eligible states and having been approved by the Congress of the United States, as required by Article I, Section 10, of the Constitution, and signed into law by the President of the United States in August, 1953.

MEMBER STATES

State of Alaska
By B. Frank Heintzleman, Governor
May 19, 1955

State of Arizona
By Howard Pyle, Governor
January 6, 1953

State of California
By Goodwin J. Knight, Governor
December 18, 1955

State of Colorado
By Dan Thornton, Governor
April 20, 1953

State of Hawaii
By William Quinn, Governor
June 23, 1959

State of Idaho
By Len Jordan, Governor
May 13, 1953

State of Montana
By John W. Bonner, Governor
December 24, 1952

State of Nevada
By Grant Sawyer, Governor
June 2, 1959

State of New Mexico
By Edwin L. Mechem, Governor
December 29, 1952

State of Oregon
By Paul L. Patterson, Governor
January 31, 1953

State of Utah
By J. Bracken Lee, Governor
January 14, 1953

State of Washington
By Arthur B. Langlie, Governor
June 9, 1953

State of Wyoming
By C. J. "Doc" Rogers, Governor
April 28, 1953